
DEPARTMENT CONTACT: Paul Krauss, Community Development Director

SUMMARY:

On Wednesday, January 16, 2013 the Council received the Lynnwood Place Development Project Notebook for review.

On Tuesday, January 22, 2013 the Council held its first Work Session for Staff to gather questions from Council relating to the Lynnwood Place Development Project on the Old Lynnwood High School site.

On Monday, January 28, 2013 the Council submitted additional questions and requests for information related to the Lynnwood Place Development Project.

On Monday, February 11, 2013 the Council will hold a Public Hearing on Lynnwood Place.

Staff will provide Council with additional information under separate cover on Thursday, January 31, 2013.

DOCUMENT ATTACHMENTS

Description: No Attachments Available

Type:
Memorandum

TO: Councilmembers
FROM: Paul Krauss, Director
DATE: January 30, 2013
RE: Lynnwood Place – Comprehensive Plan and Zoning

**Cycle #1: Responses to Councilmember Questions & Requests**

The process for Councilmember questions and requests to help prepare for the Lynnwood Place project hearing and associated decisions was provided to the Council in a memorandum entitled, “Procedures for Councilmember Questions, Quasi-Judicial Matter: Lynnwood Place” dated, January 16, 2013. It was reviewed with the Council on the same date.

As part of the January 16th review, the Council was shown the diagram of the Cycle #1 and Cycle #2 decision-making processes. A copy of that diagram showing those processes is provided in the Lynnwood Place Permit Review Binder (Binder), and is attached to this memorandum for your convenience.

The large Lynnwood Place notebook you have received addresses the facets of the broad land use policy decisions for Cycle #1. The specific development project is conceptually represented at this point with more detail to be developed in Cycle #2 of the Council decision-making process.

Please note that the Council must complete Cycle #1 land use policy decisions, which is tentatively scheduled for the end of February 2013, before it can begin consideration of the more-specific (and perhaps more tangible) issues associated with actual development and use of the land. Cycle #2 of this development review process provides for Council analysis and decision-making on project-specific details.

**Cycle #1: Responses to Councilmember Questions & Requests**

Cycle #1 involves Council decisions on broad policy level comprehensive plan and zoning matters in regard to the former Lynnwood High School site. Those matters are further delineated as follows:
1. Should the land use designation specified by the Comprehensive Plan for the former Lynnwood High School (LHS) be changed from PF-Public Facilities to MU-Mixed Use?

2. Should the text of the Comprehensive Plan’s Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element be amended to remove references to the former Lynnwood Athletic Complex?

3. Should the text of the Zoning Code’s Commercial-Residential zone be amended to accommodate the conceptual development plans for the LHS property?

4. Should the zoning of the LHS property be changed from P1 – Public to CR – Commercial-Residential?

We have recorded the Councilmember questions and requests as attached. Council questions and requests that fall within the scope of Cycle #1 (policy decisions) have been answered by staff. Conversely, responses to Council questions that properly fit into the scope of the Cycle #2 will be provided at the conclusion of Cycle #1.

Attachments
1. Responses to Council questions/requests related to Cycle #1.
2. Permit Review Process Diagram
Lynnwood Place
Cycle #1: Council Questions/Requests & Responses
Cycle #1 = Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Code & Zoning Map Amendments

Q #1.1. As I understand it, the change requested is to Mixed Use on the comprehensive plan and C/R as the actual zoning designation. I presume that the Commercial/Residential is to facilitate a component of residential development. Does this help Lynnwood meet UGA requirements for Growth? Why not use commercial zoning?

Response: Some of Lynnwood’s commercial zones do allow for limited multifamily development. For example, the Planned Regional Center designation used around the Mall does so, but only above the building’s third floor, and with limitations on the percentage of building area that may be used for residential purposes (see LMC 21.46.116). Other commercial designations like General Commercial don’t allow any residential construction. In contrast, Commercial-Residential (C-R) zone allows residential uses as a permitted use in the context of a compact, walkable community--as an intended outcome.

Q #1.2. It appears that the height limit is 7 stories for medical uses. What about residential? What about for commercial or office buildings?

Response: If Q #2 refers to the development standards for the Commercial-Residential (C-R) zone, see pages 5 and 6 of the Proposed Text Amendments (second document behind the purple tab).

LMC 21.54.200 specifies there is no maximum building height limit, with the proviso that buildings greater than 35 feet in height be set back from all property lines a minimum of one horizontal foot for every two feet in building height greater than 35 feet.

Page 2-11 of the Draft EIS indicates that maximum building height would be eight stories.

Q #1.3. Who is responsible for sending out notices to the neighborhood?

Response: The City of Lynnwood Community Development Department.

Q #1.4. The EIS on page 1-2 references the project as a binding site plan. Can you explain in what way that is true?

Response: Because the Edmonds School District will retain ownership of the entire property, some type of “alternative” method land division is expected to be used to facilitate the lease of discreet portions of the 40-acre site. Accordingly, it was appropriate for the EIS to reference future land use actions associated with the proposed development. Binding site plans are used to segregate commercial properties, such as a shopping center, where individually-owned parcels share vehicular access and parking. Additional information about this project detail
can be addressed as part of the Cycle #2 process. The City and the State’s regulations for binding site plans are provided in Chapter 19.75 LMC and RCW 58.17.035, respectively.

Q #1.5. The bypass road is listed as a 3 lane road. Has a traffic study been completed that clearly shows that 3 lanes are adequate to carry the projected traffic flow? Have you discussed the possibility of 5 lanes?

Response: See the Transportation analysis of the Draft EIS, which begins on page 3-121 of that document. The analysis of Alternative 2 (the applicant’s current proposal), begins on page 3-163. Based upon the EIS, the design is for an initial three-lane road expandable in the future to five lanes if/when needed to handle regional traffic flows.

Q #1.6. The plan calls for 500 apartments to be built in the long run. Does this number of housing units count against the total number projected for the north end of the City Center Sub Area Plan?

Response: The subject property is within the Lynnwood Regional Growth Center as designated by VISION 2040. That regional growth strategy calls for up to 425 additional dwellings (and 700 persons) in the Lynnwood Regional Growth Center. The dwellings planned for Lynnwood Place would help the area achieve the housing growth target specified by VISION 2040.

The Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan includes this property in a special planning area known as the Subregional Center. This area of Lynnwood is to accommodate a large amount of the projected population and employment growth in the City. The dwellings planned for Lynnwood Place would be counted as part of the planned population growth for the Subregional Center. Since the Lynnwood Place property is not within the City Center or the Alderwood Mall-City Center Transition Area, Lynnwood Place’s future population would not be allocated to either of those subareas.

Q #1.7. The site proposal has numerous “beautiful” pictures of other projects completed by Cypress Equities in other places. Will you require in the Development Agreement that that quality of construction at Lynnwood Place be built to the images in the pictures? Do we have any way to guarantee this quality of end product?

Response: The recommended Condition of Approval 1 (see page 15 of the Staff Report for the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment) requires a development agreement containing urban design and streetscape features, recreation and open space amenities, and architectural design standards, etc. The contents of the draft development agreement will be brought before the City Council as part of Cycle #2.
Q #1.8. Were any changes made to the 3 ring binder that were initially handed out to the Planning Commission members? If so, please elaborate.

Response: The following documents have been added since the Planning Commission’s public hearing: 1) preliminary minutes of the January 10, 2013 Planning Commission meeting; 2) project graphics presented during the hearing by Cypress Equities. Prior to the February 11, 2013 hearing, the draft Ordinances will be updated.

Q #1.9. Why do you think so few people came before the Planning Commission to give testimony on Lynnwood Place?

Response: Staff is not able to answer this question with certainty.

Q #1.10. Is the submitted proposal a good fit for this site?

Response: The Staff Reports evaluate the requested amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Code/Map, and suggest that with the addition of the recommended conditions of approval, the applications are consistent with the decisional criteria.

See the analysis of land use impacts and compatibility that begins on page 3-76 of the Draft EIS.

To the extent that project details determine “good fit”, this question relates to project details that are to be addressed during Cycle #2.

Q #1.11. What metrics will be used to measure the appropriateness of measures to be implemented to promote sustainability, per pages 13 and 14 of the Staff Report for the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment?

Response: The Comprehensive Plan policies evaluated in the Staff Report that support energy conservation and sustainability do not include specific standards. Adopted standards are those specified by the City of Lynnwood Energy Code (chapter 16.05 LMC). The recommended Condition of Approval 1 (see page 15 of the Staff Report for the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment) requires a development agreement containing “Measures to conserve energy, promote sustainability, and reduce or off-set Greenhouse Gas Emissions.” The contents of the draft development agreement will be brought before the City Council as part of Cycle #2.

Q #1.12. Confirm language to be used: “…prior to issuance of construction and building permits…” or “…prior to issuance of construction permits…” See page 15 of Staff Report, and page 2, line 22 of the draft ordinance for the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment.
Response: There is no substantive difference. For clarity, language will be revised to “…prior to issuance of construction permits…”

Q #1.13. Within the recommended Condition of Approval #2 (page 15 of Staff Report, and page 3, line 15 of the draft ordinance for the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment), stronger language should be considered. For example, Council action could be required to extend the deadline for completion of the Development Agreement instead of requiring Council to take affirmative action to rescind decisions made.

Response: Prior to receiving this question from the City Council, staff had intended to revise this draft language. Alternative language can be considered by the City Council during its forthcoming deliberation.

Q #1.14. How many gross building square feet does Alderwood Mall contain?

Response: Approximately 1.3 million.

Q #1.15. Has consideration been given to requiring an overhead pedestrian connection between the property and Alderwood Mall? If not, why not?

Response: This question was posed during the January 10, 2013 public hearing before the Planning Commission. Staff’s response to that question was that during the EIS process, impacts related to pedestrian circulation were not expected to be sufficiently adverse to warrant that level of mitigation.

As this question relates to project details that are more appropriate for Cycle #2 of the permitting process, staff suggests that discussion of this topic be deferred until that time.

Q #1.16. What is the timeline for expanding the 3 lane bypass roadway to 5 lanes? Projected cost and responsible party for improvements?

Response: There is no timeframe for expansion of the bypass road from three to five lanes. There is no projected cost for this roadway expansion. See page 3-124 of the Draft EIS.

Q #1.17. Estimated cars/hour on the bypass roadway during peak hours and peak demand days?

Response: See transportation impact analysis for Alternative 2, beginning on page 3-163 of the Draft EIS. In particular, see Figure 3-22 on page 3-166.

Q #1.18. Based on Costco’s experience at its current Lynnwood and Aurora Village stores, what is the average cars/hour frequenting the parking lot and the fueling station?
Response: See the transportation impact analysis for Alternative 2, beginning on page 3-163 of the Draft EIS. Vehicle trip generation for Alternative 2 does not identify vehicle trips for Costco separate from trips to and from the mixed-use component of Lynnwood Place. Overall, the entire Lynnwood Place development is expected to generate 1,223 net vehicle trips during the p.m. peak period (weekdays, 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.).

Q #1.19. In the last two years, has the city of Lynnwood received any complaints/comments from residents regarding the current Lynnwood Costco fueling station? If so, how many, and the nature of the complaints?

Response: No such complaints have been received.

Q #1.21. Is traffic signaling or reconfiguration being considered for 33rd, 184th, Alderwood Mall Parkway, and other major roads around the perimeter of Alderwood Mall?

Response: Traffic mitigation measures associated with Alternative 2 are summarized on page 3-169 of the Draft EIS.

Q #1.22. What provisions have been made to accommodate the added traffic volumes caused during construction?

Response: The scope of the EIS assesses long-term, or on-going impacts as construction-related impacts can be addressed as part of the review processes for right-of-way permits and construction permits. Compliance with Best Management Practices and City of Lynnwood Engineering Standards will be required. Specific issues and conditions relating to construction activity can be better addressed during Cycle #2.

Q #1.23. What if any compensation will the development pay to mitigate the damage to roads caused by construction as well as the added traffic volumes in the future?

Response: See transportation impact analysis for Alternative 2, beginning on page 3-163 of the Draft EIS.

Q #1.24. Would appear that much of the site will need to be leveled to a plane lower than what currently exists. How will any excess material be dealt with?

Response: See earth impact analysis, beginning on page 3-1 of the Draft EIS. Detailed final grading plans, including the potential need for material import or export, will be reviewed during Cycle 2.

Q #1.25. Will the Council have any input as to the exterior finish on whatever structures are built?
**Response:** Yes, during Cycle #2. See the recommended Conditions of Approval on page 15 of the Staff Report for the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment.

---

**Q #1.26.** Does the exterior lighting and signage on the development adhere to the guidelines set forth by the International Dark-Sky Association?

**Response:** See light and glare analysis, beginning on page 3-208 of the Draft EIS.

---

**Q #1.27.** Is there a mitigation plan that addresses traffic impacts on 36th Avenue and the surrounding arterials?

**Response:** See transportation impact analysis for Alternative 2, beginning on page 3-163 of the Draft EIS.

---

**Q #1.28.** How will road/pavement improvements on 184th Street SW and 36th Avenue W area be addressed with possible added stress?

**Response:** See transportation impact analysis for Alternative 2, beginning on page 3-163 of the Draft EIS.

---

**Q #1.29.** On one of the maps showing the residential component, the map shows what looks like lot lines. The buildings are referred to as apartments? Can it be clarified what those lines represent?

**Response:** The dashed lines on the second page of the applicant’s conceptual development plans (11”x17” pages behind the 1. All – part II tab) depict different phases of construction of the mixed-use portion of Lynnwood Place.

As this issue relates to project-specific details, any follow-up questions will be answered during Cycle #2.

---

**Q #1.30.** On page 1-47 of the EIS, it speaks of a planned but “unfunded” bypass road. Is that the completion of 179th Street SW that will be a developer extension?

**Response:** The unfunded bypass road referenced in the Draft EIS is the extension of 33rd Avenue West from 184th Street SW to Alderwood Mall Parkway at Maple Road. This road segment is identified in the City’s Comprehensive Transportation Plan as a long-term objective. The Development Agreement (Cycle #2) will contain additional information regarding this roadway.

---

**Q #1.31.** There is mention of possible glare to the neighbors to the west. The developer proposes some mitigation. Is there any way that neighbors to the west can be assured that they won’t be affected by increased night lights?

**Response:** See light and glare analysis, beginning on page 3-208 of the Draft EIS.
Q #1.32. On page 3-20, there are energy use considerations under consideration. Some of these would be considered green building. Has the developer made offers to build the site using Green principles?

**Response:** The recommended Condition of Approval 1 (see page 15 of the Staff Report for the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment) requires a development agreement containing “Measures to conserve energy, promote sustainability, and reduce or off-set Greenhouse Gas Emissions.” The contents of the draft development agreement will be brought before the City Council as part of Cycle #2.

Q #1.33. The conceptual site plans do not depict much open space/green space. What City of Lynnwood policies or regulations would allow, require, or prohibit use of rooftop area of buildings or parking structures for open space/green space?

**Response:** The City does not have regulations specific to roof-top open space. If desired, the City Council could address this topic during Cycle #2.
LYNNWOOD PLACE—PERMIT REVIEW PROCESS
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APPLICATIONS

Comp. Plan Amendment—MAP
Comp. Plan Amendment—TEXT
Rezone
Zoning Code Amendment
Comm.—Res. Zone
Planned Action Designation

CYCLE 1

Planning Commission Hearing ¹ → City Council Hearing

Yes →

No

Additional info. required

STAFF WORK PRODUCTS

C-R Zone Amendments
Conditions of Approval
Examples:
Development agreement
Compliance with Eng. Standards
Design standards
Phasing of infrastructure

Staff Report and Recommendation

CONTINUED REVIEW

Planned Action Designation

CYCLE 2

City Council Hearing

Yes →

No

POTENTIAL OUTCOME

Comp. Plan Amendment—MAP ADOPTED W/ CONDITIONS
Comp. Plan Amendment—TEXT ADOPTED
Rezone ADOPTED
Zoning Code Amendment
Comm.—Res. Zone ADOPTED W/ CONDITIONS

Development Agreement SIGNED

POTENTIAL OUTCOME

Planned Action Designation ADOPTED

NEGOTIATED WORK PRODUCT

Development Agreement 1
Example topics:
Site plan design
Architectural design standards
Design standards for signs
Construction of infrastructure

APPLICATIONS

Construction Permits

CYCLE 3

Construction

CYCLE 4

Timeframe (estimated)

Cycle 1
Jan. 2013
City Council Mar. 2013
Apr. 2013

Cycle 2
City Council Jul. 2013

Cycle 3
TBD, based upon Cypress’ submittals

Cycle 4
TBD by Cypress

¹ One or more meetings as needed.
Memorandum

TO: Councilmembers

FROM: Paul Krauss, Director

DATE: January 30, 2013

RE: Lynnwood Place -- Planned Action Ord. & Development Agreement

Cycle #2 Responses to Councilmember Questions & Requests

The process for Councilmember questions and requests to help prepare for the Lynnwood Place project hearing and associated decisions was provided to the Council in a memorandum entitled, “Procedures for Councilmember Questions, Quasi-Judicial Matter: Lynnwood Place” dated, January 16, 2013. It was reviewed with the Council on the same date.

As part of the January 16th review, the Council was shown the diagram of the Cycle #1 and Cycle #2 decision-making processes. A copy of that diagram showing those processes is provided in the Lynnwood Place Permit Review Binder (Binder), and is attached to this memorandum for your convenience.

The large Lynnwood Place notebook you received in January addressed the facets of the broad land use policy decisions for Cycle #1. Beginning in early March 2013 in Cycle #2 there will be more specific project development detail. However, such details are not relevant, if at all, for the purposes of decision making with the legal criteria for the broad land use policy issues in Cycle #1. Please note that the Council must complete Cycle #1 land use policy decisions, before it can begin consideration of the more specific project Cycle #2 issues and make those associated decisions.

Cycle #2: Responses to Councilmember Questions & Requests

Cycle #2 involves Council decisions concerning two important actions:

• Adoption of Planned Action Ordinance addressing most, but not all, of the environmental and other related mitigation measures for each phase of the entire project known and planned at this time.

• Adoption of a Development Agreement which will set forth greater specificity in the design and development of the project.
The Development Agreement will include information specific to the Lynnwood Place development proposal, such as architectural design, pedestrian trails, roadway improvements, phasing and schedules, and project funding.

Councilmember questions and requests that most properly fit in Cycle #2 decisions are attached. Responses to these questions will be provided at the conclusion of Cycle #1.

Attachment:
1. Council questions/requests related to Cycle #2.
2. Permit Review Process Diagram
Lynnwood Place
Cycle #2: Council Questions/Requests & Responses

Cycle #2 = Development Agreement and Planned Action

Q #2.1. Are there any estimations of what the traffic impact fee associated with this project might be? The city recently imposed traffic impact steps to mitigate the new costs to developers. Where in the step process would this project be? When the second phase of construction is commenced, would they be on a different Traffic Impact schedule?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.2. Will the project be engineered under the new drainage manual guidelines? Will there be any credit for current impervious surfaces?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.3. Will there be any underground vaults for water retention?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.4. It appears that the set aside for water retention on the north side of the project is rather small. Is there any pre-engineering that has determined the scope of the water retention?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.5. Can you estimate the cost of the full new developer-built road that will be dedicated to the city upon completion? Please include the signal costs as well (ballpark).

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.6. Are there stipulations as to the size or quality of the housing that would be built?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.
Q #2.7. While it is possible to have fee simple housing sold when the underlying instrument isn’t fee simple ownership (e.g. single family properties on the Tulalip Reservation) this would be new to the real estate market in the area. Will the residential housing aspect of this be rental property or units for sale?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.8. If the comprehensive plan and zoning are changed as proposed, the site would presumably allow a Costco store of about 160,000 square feet. How would its size relate to other Costco stores?

Response: Because the size of any particular building is not under consideration at this time, this question relates to project details that are to be addressed during Cycle #2 of the permitting process. Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.9. The topography changes considerably coming into the proposed site at the light that would come from the mall. What kind of measures would be anticipated in terms of mitigating this slope into the site?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.10. How will the development achieve Goal 4: Housing, as referenced on page 2 of the Applicant’s Attachment 1, which states, “Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock”.

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.11. The plan indicates that trees and shrubs will be removed on the outer edges of the site. What remedies are being taken to prevent erosion by rain over time?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.
Q #2.12. The plan indicates that a 6’ wooden fence will be built on the outer edges of the site. A wooden fence will not last 5 years in my estimation. Has it been suggested that this fence needs to be built out of masonry and probably needs to be 8’ tall?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.13. Who is scheduled to pay for the bypass road (3 or 5 lanes)?

Response: The question regarding funding of the bypass road (33rd Avenue W) does not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.14. The Residence Inn has filed a concern about a loading dock only 250 feet away from their hotel rooms. What precautions are being required to mitigate the sound for this established business?

Response: See page 3-62 of the Draft EIS.

Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.15. The Lynnwood Place has a huge amount of “surface” parking. Is it too late to suggest at least “more” underground parking be recommended and the surface area be converted into open/park space with walking trails added or included in some areas? Could the big hole in back be used for underground parking site?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.16. Can you provide a sample/prototype development agreement that council might review before being asked to approve one for this project?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.17. What vegetation buffer will exist along the west property line? What trees will remain?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.
Q #1.18. Projected annual retail sales and property tax revenues to the city of Lynnwood from this project?

Response: Cycle #2 topics such as public revenue generation do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.19. The FEIS mentions that there are “funding considerations” regarding the bypass roadway around the property. What are the funding considerations as they relate to the project’s proponent?

Response: The EIS identifies the bypass road as traffic mitigation required for this development. Cycle #2 topics such as mitigation funding do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.20. On page 2-1 of the Draft EIS, it lists both Costco and Cypress as developers. Will Costco or its subsidiaries be doing any development work at the site?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. The applicant may wish to provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.21 As I understand it, there will be two underground vaults, 320 feet long by 110 feet wide by 11 feet deep, each approximating the size of a football field. Is that correct?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.22 Follow-up to question submitted January 22, 2013--Is this site going to be built out under the 2005 Department of Ecology Manual guidelines or the new stringent 2012 Dept. of Ecology guidelines? The differences between the requirements are likely very dramatic and costly. All references to the drainage plan in the EIS refer to the 2005 manual. Please clarify. If the 2012 Dept. of Ecology manual is used, would the EIS need to be updated?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.

Q #2.23 Follow-up to question submitted January 22, 2013—The traffic mitigation fees calculated and stated in the EIS is 2.7 Million dollars. Ordinance 2869, passed on 11-29-
2010 codified a phasing process to mitigate the impact on developers of the new TrIF fees. In 2011, a developer would pay 20% of the fee, in 2012 the developer paid 40% of the fee, increasing each year to the full fee. Which year will apply to this application and the fee? If the 2.7 Million isn’t correct, what would the estimated TrIF fees be?

Response: Cycle #2 topics do not relate to the decision criteria for the four Cycle #1 applications. Staff will provide a response to this Cycle #2 question following Council action on the four Cycle #1 applications.
LYNNWOOD PLACE—PERMIT REVIEW PROCESS
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APPLICATIONS
- Comp. Plan Amendment—MAP
- Comp. Plan Amendment—TEXT
- Rezone
- Zoning Code Amendment
  Comm.—Res. Zone
- Planned Action Designation

STAFF WORK PRODUCTS
- C-R Zone Amendments
- Conditions of Approval
  Examples:
  - Development agreement
  - Compliance with Eng. Standards
  - Design standards
  - Phasing of infrastructure

Staff Report and Recommendation

POTENTIAL OUTCOME
- Comp. Plan Amendment—MAP ADOPTED
  W/ CONDITIONS
- Comp. Plan Amendment—TEXT ADOPTED
- Rezone ADOPTED
- Zoning Code Amendment
  Comm.—Res. Zone ADOPTED W/ CONDITIONS

Timeframe (estimated)

Cycle 1
- City Council Jan. 2013
- City Council Mar. 2013
- City Council Apr. 2013

Cycle 2
- City Council Jul. 2013

Cycle 3
- TBD, based upon Cypress’ submittals

Cycle 4
- TBD by Cypress

CONTINUED REVIEW
- Planned Action Designation

NEGOTIATED WORK PRODUCT
- Development Agreement 1
  Example topics:
  - Site plan design
  - Architectural design standards
  - Design standards for signs
  - Construction of infrastructure

POTENTIAL OUTCOME
- Planned Action Designation ADOPTED
- Development Agreement SIGNED

APPLICATIONS
- Construction Permits

1 One or more meetings as needed.